



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/825,025	04/15/2004	Ellis Edward Bishop	AUS920040026US1	7494
37945	7590	10/16/2009	EXAMINER	
DUKE W. YEE YEE AND ASSOCIATES, P.C. P.O. BOX 802333 DALLAS, TX 75380			FAN, HUA	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2456		
		NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		10/16/2009	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ptonotifs@yeeiplaw.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/825,025	BISHOP ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	HUA FAN	2456	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 June 2009.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,3 and 5-36 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,3 and 5-36 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to amendment/reconsideration file 6/25/2009, the amendment/reconsideration has been considered. Claims 1, 3 and 5-36 are pending for examination, the rejection cited as stated below.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In the remarks, applicant argued in substance that

(a) (on page 15 with respect to 101 rejection to claims 1-32) that the amended claim 1 overcomes the outstanding 101 rejection;

(b) (on page 19 with respect to claim 4) that Wickham fails to teach "responsive to determining that the capacity data is not already available, contacting the capacity data owner; requesting the capacity data; and justifying the request for the capacity data";

(c) (on pages 21-22 with respect to combining Wickham and Valdivia references in rejection to claim 3) that the motivation for combination is not sufficient.

As to point (a), the amended claim 1 does not overcome the outstanding 101 rejection by adding "gathering a plurality data for a capacity resource set, the capacity resource set including a central processing unit..." and "analyzing the capacity data by...from a database...". Such amendment does not indicate a statutory category, such an apparatus, is tied with or used to perform the major functionalities. For example, "gathering a plurality data **for** a capacity resource set" does not limit the "gathering" to be directly tied with a statutory category such as an apparatus because the capacity data **for** a capacity resource set can be simply stored on any paper form. Similarly, "extracting...from a database" step can be performed by human mind

since "database" can also be in a paper form. Therefore the examiner maintains the 101 rejection set forth in the prior office action.

As to point (b), it is to be noted that it is the combination of Valdivia and Wickham, not Valdivia or Wickham alone, which teaches this limitation. As cited in the prior office action, Wickham, col. 10, lines 51-57 and 60-62 discloses responsive to determining that the data is not already available, contacting the capacity data owner, requesting the data; and justifying the request for the data to the data owner ("if the request object...have not been retrieved, then the model object retrieves them". It is to be noted that the term "justify" is not defined in either the claim or the specification therefore the examiner uses the broad interpretation which includes the case such as "decide to retrieve data" as is a necessary step before the actual "retrieve data"). It is obvious to combine Valdivia's teaching regarding the capacity data analysis system with Wickham's teaching. The similar obviousness analysis was provided in rejection to claim 3 in the prior office action.

As to point (c), the obviousness analysis including the motivation of combination has been provided in the prior office action. Specifically, the two references were combined for a motivation of improving efficiency (Wickham, col. 10, line 63, "lazy" retrieval). The examiner To an ordinary skilled in the art at the time of invention, improving efficiency as supported by the cited lines in Wickham is a sufficient motivation to combine the teachings of Wickham and Valdivia.

Any remark regarding limitations not claimed is not being considered by examiner.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 3, 5-6 and 34 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claims 3 and 5-6 depends on a canceled claim; claim 34 recites the system of claim 32; however, claim 32 is not a system claim. For the sake of examination, the examiner assumes claims 3 and 5-6 depend on claim 1; claim 34 depends on claim 33. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

The USPTO "Interim Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications for Patent Subject Matter Eligibility" (Official Gazette notice of 22 November 2005), Annex IV, reads as follows:

Determining whether the claim falls within one of the four enumerated categories of patentable subject matter recited in 35 U.S.C. 101 (i.e., process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter) does not end the analysis because claims directed to nothing more than abstract ideas (such as mathematical algorithms), natural phenomena, and laws of nature are not eligible for patent protection. Diehr, 450 U.S. at 185, 209 USPQ at 7; accord, e.g., Chakrabarty, 447 U.S. at 309, 206 USPQ at 197; Parker v. Flook, 437 U.S. 584, 589, 198 USPQ 193, 197 (1978); Benson, 409 U.S. at 67-68, 175 USPQ at 675; Funk, 333 U.S. at 130, 76 USPQ at 281. "A principle, in the abstract, is a fundamental truth; an original cause; a motive; these cannot be patented, as no one can claim in either of them an exclusive right." Le Roy, 55 U.S. (14 How.) at 175. Instead, such "manifestations of laws of nature" are "part of the storehouse of knowledge," "free to all men and reserved exclusively to none." Funk, 333 U.S. at 130, 76 USPQ at 281.

Descriptive material can be characterized as either "functional descriptive material" or "nonfunctional descriptive material." In this context, "functional descriptive material" consists of data structures and computer programs which impart functionality when employed as a computer component. (The definition of "data structure" is "a physical or logical relationship among data elements, designed to support specific data manipulation functions." The New IEEE Standard Dictionary of Electrical and Electronics Terms 308 (5th ed. 1993).) "Nonfunctional descriptive material" includes but is not limited to music, literary works and a compilation or mere arrangement of data.

When functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized. Compare *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d 1031, 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1994) (claim to data structure stored on a computer readable medium that increases computer efficiency held statutory) and *Warmerdam*, 33 F.3d at 1360-61, 31 USPQ2d at 1759 (claim to computer having a specific data structure stored in memory held statutory product-by-process claim) with *Warmerdam*, 33 F.3d at 1361, 31 USPQ2d at 1760 (claim to a data structure per se held nonstatutory).

In contrast, a claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a computer program is a computer element which defines structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and the rest of the computer which permit the computer program's functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory. See *Lowry*, 32 F.3d at 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d at 1035.

5. Claims 1-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-32 are method claims that do not qualify as a statutory process because they cite purely mental steps, that could be performed in the human mind and that the presence of another statutory category, such as an apparatus, is not required to perform the method/process. Based on Supreme Court precedent and recent Federal Circuit decisions in *re Bilski*, Appeal No. 2007-1130, a statutory process must (1) be tied to another statutory class (such as a particular apparatus) or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) to a different state or thing. If neither of these requirements is met by the claim, the method is not a patent eligible process under 35 U.S.C. 101 and should be rejected as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Thus, to qualify as a 35 U.S.C. 101 statutory process, the claim should positively recite the other statutory class (the thing of product) to which is tied, for example, by identifying the apparatus that accomplishes the method steps, or positively recite the subject matter that is being transformed, for example by identifying the material that is being changed to a different state. Also see MPEP 2106.02. Although claims 27-36 and 44-49 recites “a computer implemented method”, there is nothing in the claims which explicitly indicates what apparatus accomplishes the method steps, or positively recite the subject matter that is being transformed, for example by identifying the material that is being changed to a different state.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, 3 and 5-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as

the invention. Independent claim 1 recites "gathering a plurality of capacity data for a capacity resource set, the capacity resource set including a central processing unit, a storage, a memory, a network or telecommunications hardware, a plurality of peripheral devices". It is not clear whether the claimed capacity resource set includes one or more of the listed elements, or includes all of the listed elements. The examiner presumes for the sake of examination that the claimed limitation reads "gathering a plurality of capacity data for a capacity resource set, the capacity resource set including a central processing unit, a storage, a memory, a network or telecommunications hardware, **or** a plurality of peripheral devices". Similarly, independent claims 33 and 36 are interpreted as "a plurality of capacity resources including a central processing unit, a storage, a memory, a network or telecommunications hardware, **or** a plurality of peripheral devices"

7. Claims 1, 3 and 5-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Independent claims 1, 33 and 36 recites "identifying a plurality of future capacity planning issues based on **a selection of** a set of..." which is not positively recited since "a selection of" can be indicative of either "selection to include", or "selection to not include". The examiner presumes for the sake of examination that the claimed limitation reads "**identifying a plurality of future capacity planning issues**"

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

9. Claims 33-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Valdivia et al (US patent 6904265).

As to claim 33, Valdivia discloses a system for managing capacity resources in a shared computing environment comprising: a service provider (figure 4, “NSP”); a plurality of service obligations (figure 4, “Wholesaler-NSP Agreements”, “NSP-BBS Agreements”);

a plurality of capacity resources including a central processing unit, a storage, a memory, a network or telecommunications hardware, a plurality of peripheral devices (see 112 rejection above and examiner’s interpretation above; col. 5, lines 1-3, “allow ST to send a specific number of packets on a satellite’s uplink to a specific Destination ST”; col. 4, lines 56-59, “rate allocation”; col. 1, lines 60-67, “system capacity...bandwidth” includes resources for CPU, a network or telecommunications hardware, etc.); and

a capacity planner that produces and maintains a capacity plan (see similar rejection to claim 1), wherein the capacity plan substantially identifies current and needed capacity resources and substantially describes the allocation of the current and needed capacity resources (col. 9, lines 11-18, “actual usage and interference statistics are available for the operator to determine which cells have excess capacity as well as the cells that are running short of capacity”), and executes the capacity plan so that the service provider meets all service obligations (col. 23, lines 5-20, “based on...contract agreement between the wholesaler and NSP...reconfigure capacity resources”);

identifying a plurality of future capacity planning issues based on a selection of a set of projection methodologies including business drivers, linear regression, percent change, direct customer input, and historical trend data (see 112 rejection and examiner's interpretation above; see col. 6, lines 43-45, "determine downlink traffic demands based on scheduled connections, traffic models, and trend information").

As to claim 34, Valdivia et al disclose the system of claim 32 wherein the capacity planner further handles capacity requests (figure 5, "Capacity Request").

As to claim 35, Valdivia et al discloses the system of claim 33 wherein the capacity planner further reviews capacity requests to identify capacity issues that should be resolved in a future capacity plan (figure 5; col. 23, lines 5-30).

As to claim 36, see similar rejection to claims 33-35.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 1, 3, 5-10, 13, 16-18, 22-26 and 28-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Valdivia, as applied to claim 33, and further in view of Wickham *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6307546).

As to claim 1, Valdivia et al discloses a computer-implemented process for managing capacity resources in a shared computing environment comprising the steps of:

gathering a plurality of capacity data for a capacity resource set, the capacity resource set including a central processing unit, a storage, a memory, a network or telecommunications hardware, a plurality of peripheral devices (see 112 rejection and examiner's interpretation above; see col. 1, line 60 - col. 2, line 5, "generating a capacity plan...selectively allocate bandwidth to the terminal in response to the bandwidth request messages. Under this approach, the capacity requirements of multiple service providers can be efficiently managed"; col. 1, lines 60-67, "system capacity...bandwidth" includes resources for CPU, a network or telecommunications hardware, etc.);

analyzing the capacity data by extracting capacity obligations from a database (col. 17, lines 58-67, "capacity resource configuration database") and comparing the capacity obligations with existing resources to identify capacity obligations that can be met with existing resources (col. 22, lines 57-67, "(1) the required services can be provided based on current system configuration of capacity resources"), and to identify capacity obligations that require additional resources (col. 22, lines 57-67, "(2) the required services can be provided, but would require reconfiguration of system capacity resources");

generating the capacity plan for using the identified existing resources and the identified additional resources to meet capacity obligations (col. 23, lines 5-18; figure 5, "Capacity Resource Configuration");

gaining approval for the capacity plan from one or more persons with the authority to commit to the implementation of the capacity plan (figure 5, "negotiation"; col. 23, lines 5-18, "negotiation between the wholesaler and NSP...authorizes");

notifying any parties to the capacity plan of the plan details (col. 23, lines 5-18, “the wholesaler instructs the NOC 107 to reconfigure capacity resources”).

handling capacity requests from a requester (col. 1, line 60 - col. 2, line 5, “The remote processor is configured to process bandwidth request messages from the terminal; figure 5, “Capacity Request”);

performing analysis review on capacity requests to identify capacity issues (figure 5, “Capacity Analysis Request”, “Analysis Response”); and

executing a problem manager program in a data-processing system to resolve any identified capacity issues so that a service provider can meet all service obligations (col. 1, line 60 - col. 2, line 5, “generating a capacity plan...selectively allocate bandwidth to the terminal in response to the bandwidth request messages. Under this approach, the capacity requirements of multiple service providers can be efficiently managed”; col. 13, lines 17-30, “allocating uplink resources based on congestion parameters and discarding packets when congestion occurs or is imminent...contend for resources in an orderly fashion as prescribed by the service capabilities, which the ST is provisioned and to respond to congestion information sent from the payload”);

identifying a plurality of future capacity planning issues based on a selection of a set of projection methodologies including business drivers, linear regression, percent change, direct customer input, and historical trend data (see similar rejection to claim 33 above).

Valdivia et al, however, does not expressly disclose responsive to determining that the capacity data is not already available, contacting the capacity data owner; requesting the capacity data; and justifying the request for the capacity data to the capacity data owner. Wickham discloses responsive to determining that the capacity data is not already available (col. 10, lines

52-56, "determine whether the requested objects have already been retrieved"), contacting the capacity data owner (col. 10, lines 60-62); requesting the capacity data; and justifying the request for the capacity data to the capacity data owner (col. 10, lines 51-57).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to combine the teachings disclosed by Valdivia, with the teachings disclosed by Wickham regarding determining if the requested data is already available; acquiring the requested data from the database; validating the requested data; determining if there is a regular need for the data; and updating and documenting the database. The suggestion/motivation of the combination would have been to improve efficiency (Wickham, col. 10, line 63, "lazy" retrieval).

As to claim 3, Valdivia discloses the process of claim 1 wherein gathering capacity data comprises the steps of:

determining capacity data requirements (figure 4, "Wholesaler-NSP Agreements; NSP-BBS Agreements");

determining suppliers of the capacity data (figure 4, NOC has separate interfaces ("IF") for Wholesaler, NSP, for example, therefore the supplier of the capacity data is determined by its corresponding interface).

Valdivia does not expressly disclose determining if the capacity data is already available; acquiring the capacity data from the database; validating the capacity data; determining if there is a regular need for the data; and updating and documenting the database. Wickham discloses determining if the requested data is already available (col. 10, lines 52-56, "determine whether the requested objects have already been retrieved");

acquiring the requested data from the database (col. 10, lines 45-48, "the information is now retrieved from a network database"; lines 58-59, "answers the "cached" objects");

validating the requested data (col. 10, lines 53-55, "checks its own state and determines whether the requested objects have already been retrieved");

determining if there is a regular need for the data (See 112 rejection above and examiner's interpretation for "regular need"; col. 10, lines 58-62, the requested data is determined as needed data) and

updating and documenting the database (col. 10, lines 58-62, "installs them into the domain model and answers them").

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to combine the teachings disclosed by Valdivia, with the teachings disclosed by Wickham regarding determining if the requested data is already available; acquiring the requested data from the database; validating the requested data; determining if there is a regular need for the data; and updating and documenting the database. The suggestion/motivation of the combination would have been to improve efficiency (Wickham, col. 10, line 63, "lazy" retrieval).

As to claim 5, Valdivia-Wickham discloses the process of claim 1 further comprising the steps of:

before gaining approval for the capacity plan, designing a configuration to support the capacity plan (Valdivia, figure 5, "Analysis Response"; col. 22, line53- col. 23, line15, before negotiating with wholesaler, it is determined 1) the requested services can be provided based on current system configuration of capacity resources. The current configuration is a configuration designed to support the capacity plan); and

testing the designed configuration to determine if the configuration is capable of balancing a workload as required to meet existing and anticipated capacity obligations (Valdivia, col. 22, line53- col. 23, line15, before negotiating with wholesaler, it is tested whether 1) the requested services can be provided based on current system configuration of capacity resources).

As to claim 6, Valdivia-Wickham discloses the process of claim 1 further comprising the step of, before gaining approval for the capacity plan, analyzing the performance impact of the capacity plan by determining the impact to the components of the capacity plan during the plan period (Valdivia, col. 22, lines 53-67).

As to claim 7, Valdivia-Wickham discloses the process of claim 1 wherein handling a capacity request comprises the steps of:

analyzing the capacity request with a problem management program (Valdivia, figure 5, “NOC” is the problem management program that analyzes the capacity request);

extracting the requester's entitlements and provided data from a database (see 112 rejection above and the examiner's interpretation; Valdivia, col. 23, lines 5-20, “Wholesaler...NPC databases”);

determining if the requester is entitled to have the capacity request satisfied (Valdivia, col. 23, lines 5-16, “based on the negotiation and contract agreement between the Wholesaler and NSP”;

responsive to determining that the requester is entitled to have the capacity request satisfied, determining if any not provided data is required to satisfy the capacity request (Valdivia, col. 23, lines 20-26, “based on the system capacity resource allocations, the wholesaler can overbook capacity allocated to NSPs”);

responsive to determining that not provided data is required to satisfy the capacity request, submitting a request for the not provided data to a collection team, receiving the non-standard data from the collection team, and reviewing the not provided data received from the collection team; analyzing the capacity plan against actual usage data (Valdivia, col. 18, lines 8-28, "location data is not provided by the ST's NSP as part of the NSP provisioning parameters...checks, over time, whether the scheduled connection parameters fall within NSP capacity provisions"); and

updating the capacity plan to reflect the result of the capacity request (Valdivia, col. 18, lines 30-32, "The NSP selectively supplies the NOC 107 with various service parameters; lines 50-55, "NOC to monitor such changes and to ensure that all ST service provisions are within the scope of the NSP's capacity provisions").

As to claim 8, Valdivia-Wickham discloses the process of claim 7 wherein analyzing the capacity plan against actual usage data comprises the steps of: obtaining plan data from the database; obtaining actual usage data from the database; comparing the plan data with actual usage data; determining from the comparison if the actual usage data deviates from the plan data; and responsive to determining that the actual usage data deviates from the plan data, investigating the deviations (Valdivia, col. 17, lines 57-67, "capacity management database, capacity resource configuration database, NSP capacity allocations database, ST service allocation database"; col. 18, lines 30-33, "the SNP selectively supplies the NOC with various service parameters"; lines 50-55, "NOC to monitor such changes and to ensure that all NST service provision are within the scope of the NSP's capacity provisions"; col. 20, lines 47-55, "identifies capacity configuration changes that may be performed during the course of a typical

day to meet capacity requirements over the region as well as constraints that may be considered when planning these changes").

As to claim 9, Valdivia-Wickham discloses the process of claim 8 wherein investigating the deviations comprises the steps of: determining if the deviation is the result of an anomaly; and responsive to determining that the deviation is a result of an anomaly, documenting the deviation (Valdivia, col. 20, lines 47-56, "to meet requirements over the region as well as the constraints...capacity planning database contains the plans for all scheduled capacity configuration". It is to be noted that the difference between the old plan and the new plan indicates the deviation. "to meet constraints" indicates an anomaly with the old plan).

As to claim 10, Valdivia-Wickham discloses the process of claim 8 wherein investigating the deviations comprises the steps of: determining if the deviation is the result of a business cycle; responsive to determining that the deviation is the result of a business cycle, documenting the deviation (Valdivia, col. 20, lines 47-56, "during the course of a typical day...a capacity planning database contains the plans for all scheduled capacity configuration". It is to be noted that the difference between the old plan and the new plan indicates the deviation).

As to claim 13, Valdivia-Wickham discloses the process of claim 1 wherein handling a capacity request comprises the steps of: analyzing the capacity request with a problem management program; extracting the requester's entitlements and standard data from a database; determining if the requester is entitled to have the capacity request satisfied; responsive to determining that the requester is entitled to have the capacity request satisfied, determining if any non-standard data is required to satisfy the capacity request; responsive to determining that non-standard data is required to satisfy the capacity request, submitting a request for the non-standard

data to a collection team, receiving the non-standard data from the collection team, and reviewing the non-standard data received from the collection team (see similar rejection to claim 7); managing capacity data for reporting; determining if new or changed reports are required; responsive to determining that new or changed reports are required, running reports (Valdivia, col. 20, lines 48-55, each saved capacity plan is equivalent to a report); and updating the capacity plan to reflect the result of the capacity request (see similar rejection to claim 7).

As to claim 16, Valdivia-Wickham discloses the process of claim 1 wherein handling a capacity request comprises the steps of: analyzing the capacity request with a problem management program; extracting the requester's entitlements and standard data from a database; determining if the requester is entitled to have the capacity request satisfied; responsive to determining that the requester is entitled to have the capacity request satisfied, determining if any non-standard data is required to satisfy the capacity request; responsive to determining that non-standard data is required to satisfy the capacity request, submitting a request for the non-standard data to a collection team, receiving the non-standard data from the collection team, and reviewing the non-standard data received from the collection team (see similar rejection to claim 7); analyzing **trends** (Valdivia, col. 19, lines 54-56, "traffic trend analysis"); and updating the capacity plan to reflect the result of the capacity request (see similar rejection to claim 7)..

As to claim 17, Valdivia-Wickham discloses the process of claim 16 wherein analyzing trends comprises the steps of: identifying relevant trends (Valdivia, col. 6, lines 45, "trend information"); obtaining historical capacity data from the database (Valdivia, col. 17, past paragraph, "allocation database"); determining if a specific analysis is required; responsive to determining that a specific analysis is required, determining if additional capacity data is

available (Valdivia, col. 19, lines 50-61; figure 5; col. 22, line 53 – col. 23, line 5), responsive to determining that additional capacity data is not available, requesting the additional capacity data from a collection team; obtaining the additional capacity data (Valdivia, col. 23, lines 1-22); selecting resource types and workload types to identify trends (Valdivia, col. 9, lines 5-40, "based on...traffic trends"); responsive to identifying trends, documenting the trends in the database (Valdivia, col. 9, lines 50-55, "measures and records the amount of broadcast capacity..."); determining if any identified trends deviate from the capacity plan (Valdivia, col. 9, paragraph 2); and responsive to determining that one or more identified trends deviates from the capacity plan, investigating the deviations (Valdivia, col. 9, paragraph 2, "determine which cells have excess capacity").

As to claim 18, Valdivia-Wickham discloses the process of claim 17 wherein investigating the deviations comprises the steps of: determining if the deviation is the result of an anomaly; and responsive to determining that the deviation is a result of an anomaly, documenting the deviation (see similar rejection to claim 9).

As to claim 22, Valdivia-Wickham discloses the process of claim 1 wherein handling a capacity request comprises the steps of: analyzing the capacity request with a problem management program; extracting the requester's entitlements and standard data from a database; determining if the requester is entitled to have the capacity request satisfied; responsive to determining that the requester is entitled to have the capacity request satisfied, determining if any non-standard data is required to satisfy the capacity request; responsive to determining that non-standard data is required to satisfy the capacity request, submitting a request for the non-standard data to a collection team, receiving the non-standard data from the collection team, and

reviewing the non-standard data received from the collection team (see similar rejection to claim 7);

analyzing commitments and thresholds (Valdivia, col. 17, lines 24-35, "restrict the ST to a certain transmission rate" is a threshold); determining if threshold changes are required; responsive to determining that threshold changes are required, using a problem manager program to determine the new threshold value; and updating the capacity plan to reflect the result of the capacity request (Valdivia, col. 17, lines 24-39).

As to claim 23, Valdivia-Wickham discloses the process of claim 22 wherein analyzing commitments and thresholds comprises the steps of: obtaining operational trend data from the database (Valdivia, col. 19, lines 54-56); obtaining capacity and performance objectives from the database (Valdivia, col. 19, lines 50-61, "to be provided"); obtaining service level attainment and customer satisfaction data from the database (Valdivia, col. 19, lines 50-61, "NSP allocations of services); determining if any service commitments have been missed; responsive to determining that one or more service commitments have been missed, determining resource usage at the time of the missed service commitment (Valdivia, col. 9, lines 12-17); reviewing thresholds against current service commitments; determining if threshold changes are required; responsive to determining if threshold changes are required, documenting the required threshold changes (Valdivia, col. 17, lines 24-37); determining if capacity plan changes are required; and responsive to determining that capacity plan changes are required, updating the capacity plan to reflect the required changes (Valdivia, col. 20, lines 48-57).

As to claim 24, Valdivia-Wickham discloses the process of claim 1 wherein handling a capacity request comprises the steps of: analyzing the capacity request with a problem

management program; extracting the requester's entitlements and standard data from a database; determining if the requester is entitled to have the capacity request satisfied; responsive to determining that the requester is entitled to have the capacity request satisfied, determining if any non-standard data is required to satisfy the request; responsive to determining that non-standard data is required to satisfy the capacity request, submitting a request for the non-standard data to a collection team, receiving the non-standard data from the collection team, and reviewing the non-standard data received from the collection team (see similar rejection to claim 7); forecasting resource requirements (Valdivia, col. 20, line 46, "expected future demand"); and updating the capacity plan to reflect the result of the capacity request (see similar rejection to claim 7).

As to claim 25, Valdivia-Wickham discloses the process of claim 24 wherein forecasting resource requirements comprises the steps of: gathering resource and workload requirements; obtaining load requirements from the database (Valdivia, col. 2, lines 33-37; col. 17, lines 58-67); obtaining historical trends from the database (Valdivia, col. 6, lines 43-46); characterizing and sizing workload requirements; determining and applying a projection methodology; forecasting and sizing periods for the workload requirements; translating the workload requirements to technical resource needs; and updating the capacity plan to reflect the technical resource needs (Valdivia, col. 19, lines 51-61, "traffic trend" indicates workload, and the "demand for services" is equivalent to technical resource needs; col. 20, lines 48-55 discloses updating capacity plans).

As to claim 26, Valdivia-Wickham discloses the process of claim 25 wherein characterizing and sizing workload requirements comprises the steps of: identifying a unit of

workload (Valdivia, col. 9, lines 1-17, “traffic patterns...subband”); determining a period of interest (Valdivia, col. 20, lines 48-54, “a typical day”); determining a magnitude of usage (Valdivia, col. 20, lines 34-35); determining a duration of usage (Valdivia, col. 20, lines 54-59); extracting resource usage data from the database for the period of interest (Valdivia, col. 9, lines 52-56, “measures and records the amount of broadcast capacity that is used by connection-oriented and connectionless service”; lines 35-40, “based on some conditions such as traffic demands”); determining the resource used per unit of workload (Valdivia, col. 9, line 20, “there are 32 demodulators per subband”); correlating the unit of workload with the resource usage data (Valdivia, col. 9, lines 35-40, “based on some conditions such as traffic demands”); applying assumptions (Valdivia, col. 9, lines 35-42, “based on...traffic demands”; col. 6, lines 43-46, “trend information” implies assuming the history information indicates future trends); applying and normalizing factors (Valdivia, col. 9, lines 23-26, “three equally spaced 16 Mbps...”); and validating results with peer reviews (Valdivia, col. 18, lines 8-20, “validate further ST provisioning parameters”).

As to claim 28, Valdivia-Wickham discloses the process of claim 1 wherein handling a capacity request comprises the steps of: analyzing the capacity request with a problem management program (Valdivia, figure 5, “capacity analysis request” and “capacity analysis response”); extracting the requester's entitlements and standard data from a database; determining if the requester is entitled to have the capacity request satisfied (see similar rejection to claim 7); responsive to determining that the requester is **not** entitled to have the capacity request satisfied, documenting the entitlement failure details; handling the service entitlement failure; and notifying the requester that the request will not be fulfilled (Valdivia, col. 22, line 52

– col. 23, line 5, "determine if the request can be met...responds to the capacity analysis request, acknowledging...5) the requested services cannot be provided").

As to claim 29, Valdivia-Wickham discloses the process of claim 28 wherein handling the service entitlement failure comprises the steps of: determining if the capacity request is covered by a contract (Valdivia, col. 22, lines 52-67, "2) the requested services can be provided but would require reconfiguration of system capacity resources" where the current configuration represents a contract; col. 23, lines 1-5, "5) the requested services cannot be provided"); and responsive to determining that the capacity request is not covered by the contract, advising the requester that the capacity request will be cancelled (Valdivia, col. 23, lines 1-5, "5) the requested services cannot be provided")..

As to claim 30, Valdivia-Wickham discloses the process of claim 28 wherein handling the service entitlement failure comprises the steps of: determining if the capacity request is covered by a contract; responsive to determining that the capacity request is covered by a contract, determining if the requester is entitled to any available alternatives; responsive to determining that the requester is entitled to one or more available alternatives, reviewing the available alternatives with the requester to gain acceptance of at least one of the available alternatives; and responsive to gaining acceptance of at least one of the available alternatives, updating the capacity plan to reflect the result of the capacity request (Valdivia, figure 5; col. 22, line 53 – col. 23, line 20).

As to claim 31, Valdivia-Wickham discloses the process of claim 28 wherein handling the service entitlement failure comprises the steps of: determining if the capacity request is covered by a contract; responsive to determining that the capacity request is covered by a

contract, determining if the requester is entitled to any available alternatives (Valdivia, figure 5; col. 22, line 53 – col. 23, line 20); responsive to determining that the requester is **not** entitled to any available alternatives (Valdivia, figure 5; col. 22, line 53 – col. 23, line 20, “the requested services cannot be provided”, i.e, even with reconfiguration of resources), obtaining approval for the original request; and updating the capacity plan to reflect the result of the capacity request (Valdivia, figure 23, lines 5-20, “negotiation”; col. 17, last paragraph, capacity plan and resource configurations are saved in database).

As to claim 32, Valdivia-Wickham discloses the process of claim 1 embedded in computer program product (see similar rejection to claim 1).

12. Claims 11, 14-15 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Valdivia, in view of Wickham, as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Wichelman et al (U.S. Patent No. 6853932).

As to claim 11, Valdivia-Wichham does not expressly disclose determining if the deviation is the result of bad data capture; and responsive to determining that the deviation is the result of a bad data capture, documenting the bad data capture details with a problem management program and documenting the deviation with a problem management program. Wichelman et al discloses determining if the deviation is the result of bad data capture; and responsive to determining that the deviation is the result of a bad data capture, documenting the bad data capture details with a problem management program and documenting the deviation with a problem management program (col. 21, last paragraph, rerun the testing by assuming the first occurrence of exception is due to bad data capture. All test results are saved as disclosed in figure 9F therefore both the exception and the deviation is documented).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to combine the teachings disclosed by Valdivia-Wickham, with the teachings disclosed by Wichelman et al regarding determining if the deviation is the result of bad data capture; and responsive to determining that the deviation is the result of a bad data capture, documenting the bad data capture details with a problem management program and documenting the deviation with a problem management program. The suggestion/motivation of the combination would have been to prevent erroneous critical alarm due to single bad data (Wichelman et al, col. 21, last paragraph).

As to claim 14, Valdivia-Wickham-Wichelman discloses the process of claim 13 wherein managing capacity data for reporting comprises the steps of: determining the data required for generating reports (col. 20, last paragraph, updated capacity plan is a type of report); determining if additional data elements are needed for generating reports (Valdivia, col. 20, last paragraph “a demodulator is move into the cell in the early morning”); responsive to determining that additional data elements are needed for generating reports, requesting the additional data elements from a data collection team (Valdivia, col. 20, last paragraph, “sending commands to the payload”, where payload is data collection team which in turn collects the additional traffic data, as shown in figure 4, “traffic measurements and statistics”), and responsive to receiving the additional data elements from the data collection team, validating the additional data elements (Valdivia, col. 18, line 16-19, “validating further ST provisioning parameters”); determining the report format (Wichelman, figure 10, “GUI”, “Group level information”, “Node level information” are formats); determining the frequency and date of reporting (Valdivia, col. 20, last paragraph, “daily”); determining the destination for the report; and notifying a report

recipient when the report is available for retrieval from a database (Wichelman, figure 10, the destination is “GUI” user. Figure 11A indicates user is notified that report is available by viewing the report window).

As to claim 15, Valdivia-Wickham-Wichelman discloses the process of claim 13 wherein running reports comprises the steps of: extracting report specifications from the database (Wichelman, figure 10 and 11A show test results which was saved in database as disclosed by figure 9F, "Store results in database"); creating pre-defined reports with a reporting program (Wichelman, figure 10 and figure 11A); determining if the report format or report content requires correction; responsive to determining that the report requires correction, making the required changes to the report (Valdivia, col. 20, last paragraph); and distributing reports to one or more report recipients (figure 11A by presenting the report to the user).

As to claim 19, Valdivia—Wickham-Wichelman discloses the process of claim 17 wherein investigating the deviations comprises the steps of: determining if the deviation is the result of a business cycle; responsive to determining that the deviation is the result of a business cycle, documenting the deviation (see similar rejection to claim 15).

As to claim 20, Valdivia-Wickham-Wichelman discloses the process of claim 17 wherein investigating the deviations comprises the steps of: determining if the deviation is the result of bad data capture; and responsive to determining that the deviation is the result of a bad data capture, documenting the bad data capture details with a problem management program and documenting the deviation with a problem management program (see similar rejection to claim 11).

13. Claims 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Valdivia, in view of Wickham, as applied to claim 1, and further in view of ON (official notice).

As to claim 27, Valdivia-Wickham discloses the process of claim 25 wherein determining and applying a projection methodology comprises the steps of: reviewing available workload data (Valdivia, col. 9, lines 1-3, "traffic patterns"); evaluating appropriateness and source of workload data (Valdivia, col. 9, lines 52-56); choosing the most appropriate projection methodology (Valdivia, col. 9, lines 36-42, "based on...traffic demands, or interference" are the most appropriate projection methodology chosen); applying the chosen projection methodology (Valdivia, col. 9, lines 36-42, "based on...traffic demands, or interference"); producing forecast projections and assumptions (Valdivia, col. 9, lines 36-42, "based on...traffic demands, or interference"; col. 20, lines 44-55, "trend analysis and expected future demand for broadcast service"; assumption implied here is that the past data can be analyzed to indicate expected future demand); and storing the forecast projections and assumptions (Valdivia, col. 20, lines 44-55, "trend analysis and expected future demand for broadcast service" implies stored before it can be used), but does not expressly disclose stored in the database. An official notice is taken here that it is a known practice at the time of invention to store data in a database and obvious for an ordinary skilled in the art to apply such practice to the process disclosed by Valdivia, in order to standardize data storing and searching and improve efficiency.

14. Claims 12 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Valdivia, in view of Wickham, and Wichelman, as applied to claim 11, and further in view of Whitman, Jr. (US patent 7499844)

As to claim 12, Valdivia-Wickham-Wichelman discloses the process of claim 8 wherein investigating the deviations comprises the steps of: determining if the deviation is the result of an unknown reason; and responsive to determining that the deviation is the result of an unknown reason, documenting the deviation with a problem management program (see similar rejection to claim 11 where “bad data” is a general category and the exact cause is “unknown”), and documenting the required capacity plan changes (Valdivia, col. 20, last paragraph) but does not expressly disclose determining if the deviation is likely to re-occur. Whitman, Jr. disclose determining if an event is likely to re-occur (claim 3).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to combine the teachings disclosed by Valdivia-Wickham-Wichelman, with the teachings disclosed by Whitman, Jr regarding determining if an event is likely to re-occur. The suggestion/motivation of the combination would have been to predict variations (Whitman, Jr., claim 3).

As to claim 21, Valdivia-Wickham-Wichelman-Whitman discloses the process of claim 17 wherein investigating the deviations comprises the steps of: determining if the deviation is the result of an unknown reason; and responsive to determining that the deviation is the result of an unknown reason, documenting the deviation with a problem management program, determining if the deviation is likely to **re-occur**, and responsive to determining that the deviation is likely to re-occur, documenting the required capacity plan changes (see similar rejection to claim 12).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HUA FAN whose telephone number is (571)270-5311. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9am-6pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on (571) 272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/H. F./
Examiner, Art Unit 2456

/Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2456